XI-HC-22

(27)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक M.A.No.895/04 सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

MISC. APPEAL No. 895/2004

Appellant Applicant Soukhilal, S/o. Lakhanlal, aged about 45 years, Kurmi, Agriculturist, R/o. Village Newsa, P.S. Ratanpur, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)

Versus

Respondents Non-applicants

1. Ganga Ram, Son of Ramdayal Kurmi, aged 45 years
2. Rameshwar, son of Ramdayal Kurmi, aged 42 years
3. Durga Prasad, son of Ramdayal Kurmi, aged 22 years,
4. Santosh, son of Murarilal Kurmi, aged 28 years

All residents of village Newsa, P.S. Ratanpur, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)

BEFORE: HON'BLE SHRI DHIRENDRA MISHRA, J

11-4-2007

Shri Alok Bakshi, Advocate for the appellant.

Shri V.K. Mishra, Advocate for the respondents.

Heard on M.C.P. 1222/2004, application for condonation of delay in filing this appeal as the appeal has been preferred with a delay of 282 delays, as per office note dated 18-8-2004.

The grounds taken by the applicant in the application for condonation of delay have been seriously disputed by the counsel for the respondents in their reply. It has been stated in the reply that the appellant was prosecuting his matter personally before the

(पीछे देखिये)

XI-HC-22

(28)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक M.A-No. 895/2004 **सन्** **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

Commissioner; he was present on 6-9-2003 before the Commissioner and had put his signature in the order sheet and the reason assigned by the appellant for delay in filing the appeal on the face of it is false. In support of the reply, the affidavit of the respondent as also certified copy of order dated 6-9-2003 has been annexed.

Considering the rival contentions of the parties, the reasons assigned by the appellant for filing this appeal with an inordinate delay of 282 days cannot be construed sufficient and accordingly the application (M.C.P. No. 1222/2004) for condonation of delay is rejected.

Consequently, the misc. appeal is also dismissed as barred by limitation.

Sd/-
DHIRENDRA MISHRA
Judge